



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/468,437 06/06/95 HODA

T 3408/589

SIDLEY & AUSTIN  
717 NORTH HARWOOD  
SUITE 3400  
DALLAS, TX 75201

WM02/1122

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2615

DATE MAILED: 11/22/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

DP

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
**08/468,437**

Applicant(s)

**Hoda et al**

Examiner

**HUY NGUYEN**

Group Art Unit

**2615**

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 7, 2000

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 20-22, 31-34, 37, and 40-46 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 20-22, 31-34, 37, and 40-46 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2615

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Continued Prosecution Application*

1. The request filed on Oct 25, 2000 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CAR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 08/468437 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CAR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was

Art Unit: 2615

made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 40-42 are are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki (5,034,804) in view of Kinoshita et al (4,897,732).

Regarding claim 40, Sasaki discloses a camera apparatus (Figs 1 and 6) comprising:

a camera body ( Fig 1, 6A-6B);

an image device ( 20,26);

first memory (316) and second memory ( ID card 15) for storing image information from the image device);

detecting means (CPU 24) for detecting a available capacity of one of the first and second memory (column 9, lines 15-37) ; and

changing means (CPU) for selectively changing between a first condition for storing and holding the image signal from the image device in the first memory when the available capacity of the second memory is not sufficient for storing the images or storing the image signal from image device in the second memory when the capacity of the second memory is sufficient to store the image signal (column 9, lines 19-35) .

Sasaki further teaches a reproducing device (Fig. 11) for reproducing the image signal rom second memory but fails to specifically teach that the reproduction device can selectively reproduce the image signal from the first memory . However, it is noted that using a

Art Unit: 2615

reproduction device as an monitor to reproduce the image signal from a first memory and a second memory supplied thereto is well known in the art as taught by Kinoshita . Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Sasaki with Kinoshita by using a reproducing device as taught by Kinoshita for selectively reproducing the image signal from the first memory or the second memory .

Regarding claim 41, Sasaki further teaches that the second memory is a semiconductor memory (IC card SRAM) but fails to teach that the first memory is also a semiconductor memory. However, it is noted that using a semiconductor memory for storing data is well known in the art . Therefore Official Notice is taken and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Sasaki by using a semiconductor memory as an alternative to the first memory of Sasaki for storing the image data .

Regarding claim 42, Sasaki further teach a view finder (130) (Fig. 13, column 1, lines 35-63) .

4. Claims 20-22 , 33 and 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi view of Sasaki .

Regarding claims 20-22, and 43-44, Takahashi discloses a camera apparatus (Fig 1) comprising:

- a camera body (10);
- an image device (110);

Art Unit: 2615

first memory (36 or 58) and second memory (40) for storing image information from the image device (column 11 and column 15, lines 1-30);

recording means and reproducing means (50) and (25) for recording and reproducing the image information (column 11 and column 15, lines 1-30);

changing means (22, 128) for changing between a first condition ( memory size which is selected by user ) to storing the image form picked up by image device to the first memory , and in a second condition to store the image pickup from image device to the second memory based a detected condition of one of the first and second memory ( by detecting the rate of the image data input to the buffer or the amount of the data ); and

a control means for selecting the memory based on detected signal (column 7, lines 40-47)

Takahashi fails to teach that the first memory is a semiconductor memory.

However, it is noted that employing a semiconductor memory device such as an IC card device which is detachable from a camera unit and the memory of SRAM kind for storing image signals and semiconductor memory reproducing means for reproducing image signals in order to reduce the size of the overall apparatus is well known in the art as taught by Sasaki et al (column 7, lines 60-65). Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Takahashi with Sasaki by providing the apparatus of Takahashi with the semiconductor memory of SRAM kind as taught by Sasaki et al as an alternate to the first memory or second memory of Takahashi apparatus in order to reduce the size of the overall apparatus.

Art Unit: 2615

Regarding claim 33, Takahashi fails to specifically teach a finder for find the image object. However, it is noted that using a finder for a camera is well known in the art. Therefore, Official Notice is taken and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Takahashi by using a view finder for the camera for finding the image object thus provide more convenience to the user when catching the image to be recorded.

5. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi in view of Sasaki as applied to claims 20 above, further in view of Finelli.

Takahashi as modified with Sasaki fails to specifically teaches the use of a printer for the camera as recited in claim 36. However, it is noted that using a printer for making a copy of the image is well known in the art as taught by Finelli (See Finelli, Figs. 1 and 3). Therefore, it would obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Takahashi with Finelli by providing a printer as taught by Finelli into the camera apparatus of Takahashi as modified with Sasaki in order to provide a copy of the selected select image to the user.

6. Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi in view of Sasaki and Kinoshita (4,897,732).

Regarding claim 45, Takahashi as modified with Sasaki fails further teach means for reading image form the first and second memory (See Sasaki) but fails to teach a selecting means for supplying the image signal from the first memory or the second memory to the reproducing

Art Unit: 2615

device . However, it is noted reading the using a selecting means for selecting the image for selecting and outputting the image signals from different sources to a reproduction device is well known in the art as taught by Kinoshita (Fig. 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Takahashi as modified with Sasaki by using a selecting means as taught by Kinoshita for selectively outputting the image from the first memory or second memory to the reproducing device for viewing the selected image .

7. Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi in view of Sasaki and Kinoshita applied to claims 23 above, further in view of Orii.

Takahashi as modified with Sasaki and Kinoshita fails to specifically teaches that the reproduction device is with the camera body. However, it is noted that incorporating a reproduction device for displaying images within a camera body is well known in the art as taught by Orii (Fig.3, column 6, lines 39-47). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Takahashi as modified with Sasaki and Kinoshita with Orii by installing a reproducing device as taught of Orii with the camera body in order to provide more convenience the user when viewing the image .

8. Claims 31 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang in view of Sasaki et al.



Art Unit: 2615

Lang discloses an editing apparatus for comprising:

a first reception unit for receiving a memory (13)(column 6, lines 1-20).

a second reception unit (11) for receiving a memory device (column 3, lines 58 to column 4, line 16);

signal processing means (26) for expanding (restoring ) the compressed image signal from the memory (column 9, lines 20-30);

recording and reading means for recording and reading the expanded image signal (restored image signal )on and from the memory device (11,23) (column 3, lines 58-62, column 9, lines 1-68).

Lang further teaches that the memory is a semiconductor (SRAM)(column 6, lines 1-20) , but fails to teach that the memory is a memory card which is removable (column 6, lines 1-20).

However, it is noted that using a memory as a memory card for recording image signal and reception unit to enable the memory card can be removed from an apparatus is well known in the art as shown by Sasaki.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lang with Sasaki by proving a memory card and a reception unit of the memory card as taught by Sasaki into the apparatus of Lang as an alternate memory of Lang and incorporate a reception unit to enable the memory card can be received and removed from the apparatus in order to reduce the size of the overall apparatus and easily replace the memory card.

Art Unit: 2615

Further for claim 31, Lang as modified with Sasaki teach that the image information is produced by a camera (See Lang and Sasaki references).

9. Claim 32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang in view of Sasaki as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of Watanabe.

Lang fails to specifically teach that the image signal is compressed in a DCT manner. However, it is noted that expanding a compressed image signal in a DCT manner is well known in the art as shown by Watanabe (Fig. 2, column 5, lines 27-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lang with Watanabe by providing apparatus of Lang with a DCT compressing and expanding as taught by Watanabe to compress and expand the image signals in order to improve the quality of the image signal

### *Response to Arguments*

10. Applicant's arguments filed Feb 7, 2000 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In Remarks, pages 11 and 12, applicants argue that Lang as modified with Sasaki fails to teach a plurality of removable memories and fails to teach. A processor for storing the compressed image signal from the removable memory card. In response, it is submitted that the proposed combination of Lang and Sasaki does teach a plurality of removable memories since



Art Unit: 2615

Lang teaches an editing apparatus which comprises a memory device (23) (column 5, line 37 to column 4, line 16) and a memory 13 (column 6, lines 8-12) and Sasaki teaches the use of a memory card can be removable from the recording apparatus. Therefore, the combination of Lang Sasaki will provide a removable memory card (13) for the editing apparatus. Lang as modified with Sasaki further teaches a processor (29) for restoring (expanding) the image signal (See Lang reference) from the removable memory card (13) and then the restored image signal is transferred to and stored in the memory device (11,23). Therefore, the combination of Lang and Sasaki would teach the removable memory card (13) having the image signal which require restoration before storing in the memory device (23).

### *Conclusion*

11. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the parent application prior to the filing of this Continued Prosecution Application under 37 CAR 1.53(d) and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL even though it is a first action after the filing under 37 CAR 1.53(d). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CAR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2615

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CAR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huy Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-4775. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 6:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber, can be reached on (703) 305-4929.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Application/Control Number: 08/468,437

Page 12

Art Unit: 2615

**Washington, D.C. 20231**

or faxed to:

**(703) 308-6306**

Or:

**(703) 308-6296**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to **Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).**

H.N

November 20, 2000

  
**HUY NGUYEN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**